



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,770	04/30/2007	Nan-Yao Su	UF-412XC1	2272
23557 7590 04/15/2010 SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO Box 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614				
EXAMINER				
LEVY, NEIL S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1615				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/15/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

euspto@slspatents.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/589,770

Applicant(s)

SU ET AL.

Examiner

NEIL LEVY

Art Unit

1615

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 3, 6 and 13-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5 and 7-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/5/09 & 3/17/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election of Methoxyfenozide and noviflumuran species in the reply filed on 3/11/22010 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

ClaimS 2, 3, 6 and 13-22 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 3/11/10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,4,5,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by POPPEN et al 6123756

See Claim 1; compositions of molt accelerator tebufenozide or halofenozide or tebufenozide analogue and a chitin synthesis inhibitor, azadirachtin.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by KARR et al WO 98/344481.

Termites are controlled by application of compositions of molt accelerator and chitin synthesis inhibitor (summary) as cellulosic bait (page 15, bottom), dusts (page 17, lines 10-14) and liquids (page 18).

Lufenuron is mentioned (page 5) and baits are placed in durable housings (page 5, bottom).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,4,5,7- 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KARR et al in view of POPPEN et al and SU.

KARR (above) provides the essence of the instant invention, but not every compound.

POPPEN (above) provides the instant compounds, but not as termite bait.

SU provides termite baits (col 6, lines 9, 10) in hermetically sealed bait, in durable housings (col 6, lines 15-31; 42+).

Given the termiticides known, shown by all three references, and KARR's teaching of the combination as superior, one would be motivated to utilize the newer toxicants of POPPEN and apply them as taught by SU.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to utilize termite control means, to use any of art recognized means, as of the KARR baits, modified as desired to increase stability, dispersibility, compatibility of ingredients, processing ease, reduced toxicity to handlers and as shown by POPPEN to provide both molt accelerator and a chitin synthesis inhibitor, & by SU to use hermetically sealed bait, in durable housings.

All the critical elements of the instant are disclosed. The amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular species and application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the administration of the particular ingredients' or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ROBERT A. WAX can be reached on 571-272-0623. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/NEIL LEVY/
ART UNIT 1615

4/11/2010